

Appl. No. 10/799,195  
Examiner: Wright, Ingrid D, Art Unit 2835  
In response to the Office Action dated January 20, 2006

Date: April 13, 2006  
Attorney Docket No. 10113871

## REMARKS

Applicant thanks the Examiner for acknowledging Applicant's claim to foreign priority and receipt of the certified copy of the priority document. Responsive to the Office Action mailed on January 20, 2006 in the above-referenced application, Applicant respectfully requests amendment of the above-identified application in the manner identified above and that the patent be granted in view of the arguments presented. No new matter has been added by this amendment.

### Present Status of Application

Claims 1-13 are withdrawn from consideration. Claims 14-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Landry et al (US 2003/0021083, hereinafter "Landry"). Claims 18, 19, 23 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Landry in view of Hubbard (US 2002/0122291, hereinafter "Hubbard"). Claims 21, 24 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Landry in view of Doczy et al (US 6,788,527, hereinafter "Doczy"). Claims 20, 22, and 27 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

In this paper, claims 1-13 are canceled without prejudice. Claim 14 is amended to recite that the distance between the first free end of the first supporting element and the second free end of the second supporting element changes when either of the first and second supporting elements rotates. Claim 22 is amended to correct its dependency. New claims 28-36 are added. Support for the amendments and new claims can be found at least in Figs. 4, 6 and 8 and pages 8-10 of the application. Thus, on entry of this amendment, claims 14-36 are pending.

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in light of the amendments and the remarks contained below.

Appl. No. 10/799,195  
Examiner: Wright, Ingrid D, Art Unit 2835  
In response to the Office Action dated January 20, 2006

Date: April 13, 2006  
Attorney Docket No. 10113871

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant thanks the Examiner for his indication in the Office Action that claims 20, 22 and 27 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 102(e)

Claims 14-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Landry. To the extent that the grounds of the rejections may be applied to the claims now pending in this application, they are respectfully traversed.

To anticipate a claim, a reference must teach every element of the claim. In this regard, the Federal Circuit has held:

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987).

"The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

As amended, claim 14 recites that the first supporting element has a first rotating end and a first free end opposite thereto, the second supporting element has a second rotating end and a second free end opposite thereto, the first and second rotating ends are rotatably connected to the main body, the first rotating end is rotatably connected to the second rotating end, and the distance between the first free end and the second free end changes when either of the first and second supporting elements rotates.

Landry teaches a display 88 including two orientation arms 220, 222 rotatably coupled thereto via hinges 228, 230, respectively. Applicant notes that the orientation arms are separately

Appl. No. 10/799,195

Examiner: Wright, Ingrid D, Art Unit 2835

In response to the Office Action dated January 20, 2006

Date: April 13, 2006

Attorney Docket No. 10113871

coupled to the display 88. In particular, the rotating end of orientation arm 220 is not rotatably connected to the rotating end of orientation arm 222. Furthermore, the distance between the free ends of the orientation arms 220 and 222 does not change when either of the orientation arms 220 and 222 rotates.

Because the Examiner identifies orientation arms 220 and 222 of Landry as the alleged first and second supporting elements of claim 14, and because rotating ends of orientation arms 220 and 222 are not "rotatably connected" to each other, Applicant submits that Landry fails to teach or suggest the claim feature of a first rotating end of a first supporting element is rotatably connected to a second rotating end of a second supporting element. Similarly, because the distance between the free ends of orientation arms 220 and 222 does not change when either of the orientation arms 220 and 222 rotates, Applicant submits that Landry fails to teach or suggest the claim feature of the distance between a first free end of a first supporting element and the second free end of a second supporting element changes when either of the first and second supporting elements rotates.

For at least the reasons described above, it is Applicant's belief that Landry fails to teach or suggest all the limitations of claim 14. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 14 be withdrawn and the claim passed to issue. Insofar as claims 15-27 depend from claim 14 either directly or indirectly, and therefore incorporate all of the limitations of claim 14, it is Applicant's belief that these claims are also in condition for allowance.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claims 18, 19, 23 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Landry in view of Hubbard. Claims 21, 24 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Landry in view of Doczy. As noted above, it is Applicant's belief that claims 18, 19, 21, and 23-26 are allowable at least by virtue of their dependency from claim 14. For this reason, the Examiner's arguments in connection with these claims are considered moot and will not be addressed here.

Appl. No. 10/799,195  
Examiner: Wright, Ingrid D, Art Unit 2835  
In response to the Office Action dated January 20, 2006

Date: April 13, 2006  
Attorney Docket No. 10113871

New Claims 28-36

New claim 18 recites a display device comprising a main body; a hinge structure rotatably connected to the main body; and a supporting structure connected to the hinge structure, the supporting structure comprising a first supporting element and a second supporting element, the first supporting element and the second supporting element rotatably connected to the hinge structure.


Applicant submits that none of the prior art relied upon by the Examiner teaches or suggests a hinge structure rotatably connected to the main body, and a supporting structure connected to the hinge structure, the supporting structure comprising a first supporting element and a second supporting element, wherein the first supporting element and the second supporting element are rotatably connected to the hinge structure. Applicant therefore submits that claim 28 is in condition for allowance.

Dependent claims 29-36 are believed to be allowable both by virtue of their dependency from claim 28 and for the novel and nonobvious claim features recited therein.

Conclusion

The Applicant believes that the application is now in condition for allowance and respectfully requests so.

Respectfully submitted,



Nelson A. Quintero  
Reg. No. 52,143  
Customer No. 34,283  
Telephone: (310) 401-6180

P116440NAQ